

**This Page is Inserted by IFW Indexing and Scanning
Operations and is not part of the Official Record**

BEST AVAILABLE IMAGES

Defective images within this document are accurate representations of the original documents submitted by the applicant.

Defects in the images include but are not limited to the items checked:

- BLACK BORDERS**
- IMAGE CUT OFF AT TOP, BOTTOM OR SIDES**
- FADED TEXT OR DRAWING**
- BLURRED OR ILLEGIBLE TEXT OR DRAWING**
- SKEWED/SLANTED IMAGES**
- COLOR OR BLACK AND WHITE PHOTOGRAPHS**
- GRAY SCALE DOCUMENTS**
- LINES OR MARKS ON ORIGINAL DOCUMENT**
- REFERENCE(S) OR EXHIBIT(S) SUBMITTED ARE POOR QUALITY**
- OTHER:** _____

IMAGES ARE BEST AVAILABLE COPY.

As rescanning these documents will not correct the image problems checked, please do not report these problems to the IFW Image Problem Mailbox.



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/872,245	05/31/2001	Russell Y. Webb	PALM-3666	2406
7590	08/16/2004		EXAMINER	
WAGNER, MURABITO & HAO LLP			STORK, KYLE R	
Third Floor			ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
Two North Market Street			2178	
San Jose, CA 95113				

DATE MAILED: 08/16/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary	Application No.	Applicant(s)
	09/872,245	WEBB, RUSSELL Y. <i>SJ</i>
	Examiner	Art Unit
	Kyle R Stork	2178

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --
Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) Responsive to communication(s) filed on 31 May 2001.
- 2a) This action is **FINAL**. 2b) This action is non-final.
- 3) Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are pending in the application.
 - 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) Claim(s) 1-24 is/are rejected.
- 7) Claim(s) 20-24 is/are objected to.
- 8) Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) The drawing(s) filed on _____ is/are: a) accepted or b) objected to by the Examiner.

Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).

Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
 - a) All b) Some * c) None of:
 1. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 2. Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 3. Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892)	4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948)	Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____
3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)	5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____	6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____

DETAILED ACTION

Specification

1. Applicant is reminded of the proper language and format for an abstract of the disclosure.

The abstract should be in narrative form and generally limited to a single paragraph on a separate sheet within the range of 50 to 150 words. It is important that the abstract not exceed 150 words in length since the space provided for the abstract on the computer tape used by the printer is limited. The form and legal phraseology often used in patent claims, such as "means" and "said," should be avoided. The abstract should describe the disclosure sufficiently to assist readers in deciding whether there is a need for consulting the full patent text for details.

The language should be clear and concise and should not repeat information given in the title. It should avoid using phrases which can be implied, such as, "The disclosure concerns," "The disclosure defined by this invention," "The disclosure describes," etc.

2. The abstract of the disclosure is objected to because of undue length. Correction is required. See MPEP § 608.01(b).
3. The disclosure is objected to because of the following informalities: on page 2, the applicant references patent number "5,125,0398".

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Objections

4. Claims 20-24 objected to because of the following informalities.

As per dependent claim 20, the applicant claims, "a single touchscreen displaying is used implement the first area and the second area." For the purpose of examining prior art, the examiner will read the section as "a single touch-screen display is used to implement the first area and the second area."

As per independent claim 21, the applicant claims, “a computer system cost the computer device...” For the purpose of examining prior art, the examiner will read the section as “a computer system causes the computer device...”

All claims not specifically objected to are objected to due to their dependence upon an objected claim.

Appropriate correction is required.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 102

5. The following is a quotation of the appropriate paragraphs of 35 U.S.C. 102 that form the basis for the rejections under this section made in this Office action:

A person shall be entitled to a patent unless –

(b) the invention was patented or described in a printed publication in this or a foreign country or in public use or on sale in this country, more than one year prior to the date of application for patent in the United States.

6. Claims 1, 3, and 9 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 102(b) as being anticipated by Takahashi et al. (U.S. 5,583,543).

As per independent claim 1 Takahashi disclose a computer implemented method of implementing a touch screen user interface for a computer system the method comprising the steps:

- Accepting text input strokes in a first touch-screen area (Figure 3(b), item 24; column 10, lines 47-48; column 3, lines 20-24)
- Displaying recognized text from the text input strokes in a second touch screen area (Figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60; column 3, lines 25-29)

Art Unit: 2178

- Displaying the text input strokes in the first touch screen area (Figure 3(c), see “very” in item 22; column 9, lines 13-15)
- Recognizing the text input strokes and displaying recognized text in the second touch-screen area (figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60)
- Displaying a portion of the recognized text in the first touch-screen area, the portion of the recognized text shown as the text input strokes are recognized (Figure 3(c); column 10, line 61- column 11, line 11)

As per dependent claim 3 Takahashi discloses the method including the steps of displaying the portion of the recognized text in the first touch-screen area in a first format and displaying the recognized text in the second touch-screen area in a second format, wherein the first format is larger than the second format (Figure 3(c)).

As per dependent claim 9 Takahashi discloses the method above wherein the step of recognizing the text input strokes includes immediately recognizing a character after a user completes at least one stroke that defines a character (column 10, line 61- column 11, line 11).

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

7. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

8. Claims 2 and 5 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Lui et al. (U.S. 6,256,009).

As per dependent claim 2 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method of implementing the step of scrolling the portion of the recognized text in the first touch-screen area as new text input strokes are recognized. However, Liu discloses scrolling the text as new input strokes are recognized (column 1, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method for handwriting input with Liu's method of scrolling text, since it would have allowed a user to continue to write without having to manually scroll text or worry about writing newer text on top of older text.

As per dependent claim 5 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi discloses implementing editing by replacing one or more previously recognized characters of the portion of the recognized text with newly recognized one or more characters by recognizing new text input strokes made over the one or more previously recognized characters (column 9, lines 32-35; column 10, lines 37-39; column 10, lines 51-60). Takahashi fails to disclose editing the portion of the text in the first touch-screen area. Liu discloses a single touch-screen area used for all input (Figures 3-11).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of replacing characters by

inputting new text strokes over them with Liu's single screen interface, since it would have allowed the user to enter newer characters directly over older characters wherever the older characters were displayed on the touch-screen.

9. Claim 4 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above and in further view of Cobbley et al. (U.S. 5,546,538).

As per dependent claim 4 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi also discloses displaying the text input strokes in a first part of the first touch-screen area (column 3, lines 20-24). However, Takahashi fails to disclose displaying the portion of the recognized text in the second part of the first touch-screen area, wherein the text input strokes are shown in the first part until the text input strokes are recognized and resulting recognized text shown in the second part. However, Cobbley discloses a touch-screen area wherein the input strokes are displayed in a first touch-screen area and displaying the portion of the recognized text in the second part of the first touch-screen area, wherein the text input strokes are shown in the first part until the text input strokes are recognized and resulting recognized text shown in the second part (Figure 1; column 3, lines 26-32).

It would have been obvious to one skilled in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting input into a first area with Cobbley's method of displaying recognized text in the same area, since it would have allowed users to enter and view text in the same touch-screen area.

Art Unit: 2178

10. Claims 6, 8, and 10-11 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Berman et al. (U.S. 5,760,773).

As per dependent claim 6 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method of implementing draggable navigation of the recognized text in the second touch-screen area by dragging a boundary of the first touch-screen area to change the portion of the recognized text shown in the first touch-screen area. However, Berman discloses the method of draggable navigation by dragging a boundary of a screen area (column 9, lines 52-54).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting input with Berman's method of changing screen size by virtue of a draggable boundary, since it would have allowed a user to resize the writing and display areas inversely in a method that is traditionally used in software applications.

As per dependent claim 8 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method of implementing a draggable scroll controller within the first touch-screen area for scrolling the portion of the recognized text displayed in the first touch-screen area. However, Berman discloses a draggable scroll controller (column 9, lines 37-40).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting input with

Berman's method of scrolling text with a draggable scroll controller, since it would have allowed a user to view text that appears before the current word in a method that is traditionally used in software applications.

As per dependent claim 10 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method wherein the touch-screen is provided on a person information device. However, Berman disclose a personal information device (column 1, lines 41-48; column 11, lines 2-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting input with Berman's method of using a personal information device as the touch-screen, since it would have allowed a user the ability to use the method on a portable device.

As per dependent claim 11 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method wherein the touch-screen is provided on a palmtop computer system. However, Berman disclose a palmtop computer system (column 1, lines 41-48; column 11, lines 2-5).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting input with Berman's method of using a personal information device as the touch-screen, since it would have allowed a user the ability to use the method on a portable device.

11. Claim 7 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi in further view of Bennett (U.S. 2002/0143831).

As per dependent claim 7 Takahashi discloses the limitations similar to those in claim 1 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi fails to disclose the method further including the step of implementing tab spots in the touch-screen area to change location of a text entry point with respect to a plurality of fields. However, Bennett discloses the method of implementing tab spots to change location of a text entry point with respect to a plurality of fields (page 10, paragraph 179).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of handwriting text input with Bennett's method of changing data fields, since it would have allowed a user to navigate anywhere and edit any field using only one key (Bennett: page 10, paragraph 179).

12. Claims 12-13, 15-16, 18, and 20-24 rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi and Berman and further in view of Liu.

As per independent claim 12 Takahashi and Berman disclose a hand-held computer implemented method (Berman: column 1, lines 41-48; column 11, lines 2-5), of implementing a user interface for a computer system, the method comprising the steps of:

- Accepting text input strokes in a first area (Figure 3(b), item 24; column 10, lines 47-48; column 3, lines 20-24)

- Displaying recognized text from the text input strokes in a second area (Figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60; column 3, lines 25-29)
- Displaying the text input strokes in the first area (Figure 3(c), see “very” in item 22; column 9, lines 13-15)
- Recognizing the text input strokes and displaying recognized text in the second area (figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60)
- Displaying a portion of the recognized text in the first area, the portion of the recognized text shown as the text input strokes are recognized (Figure 3(c); column 10, line 61- column 11, line 11)

Takahashi and Berman fail to disclose scrolling the portion of the recognized text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized. However, Liu discloses scrolling the text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized (column 1, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant’s invention to have combined Takahashi and Berman’s method of inputting handwriting with the Liu’s method of automatically scrolling handwritten input, since it would have allowed a user to continue to write without having to manually scroll text or worry about writing newer text on top of older text.

As per dependent claim 13 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi discloses the method including the steps of displaying the portion of the recognized text in the first touch-screen area in a first format and displaying the recognized text in the

second touch-screen area in a second format, wherein the first format is larger than the second format (Figure 3(c)).

As per dependent claim 15 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi and Liu also disclose implementing editing by replacing one or more previously recognized characters of the portion of the recognized text with newly recognized one or more characters by recognizing new text input strokes made over the one or more previously recognized characters (Takahashi: column 9, lines 32-35; column 10, lines 37-39; column 10, lines 51-60) in a first area (Liu: Figures 3-11).

As per dependent claim 16 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Berman also discloses the method of draggable navigation by dragging a boundary of a screen area (column 9, lines 52-54).

As per dependent claim 18 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Berman also discloses a draggable scroll controller (column 9, lines 37-40).

As per dependent claim 20 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Liu also discloses the method wherein a single touch-screen display is used to implement the first and second area (Figures 3-11).

As per independent claim 21 Takahashi and Berman disclose a hand-held portable computer device (Berman: column 1, lines 41-48; column 11, lines 2-5), a

computer readable medium having computer readable code which when executed by a computer system cause the computer device to implement a user interface method, the method comprising the steps of:

- Accepting text input strokes in a first area (Figure 3(b), item 24; column 10, lines 47-48; column 3, lines 20-24)
- Displaying recognized text from the text input strokes in a second area (Figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60; column 3, lines 25-29)
- Displaying the text input strokes in the first area (Figure 3(c), see “very” in item 22; column 9, lines 13-15)
- Recognizing the text input strokes and displaying recognized text in the second area (figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60)
- Displaying a portion of the recognized text in the first area, the portion of the recognized text shown as the text input strokes are recognized (Figure 3(c); column 10, line 61- column 11, line 11)

Takahashi and Berman fail to disclose scrolling the portion of the recognized text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized. However, Liu discloses scrolling the text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized (column 1, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi and Berman's method of inputting handwriting with the Liu's method of automatically scrolling handwritten input, since it

computer readable medium having computer readable code which when executed by a computer system cause the computer device to implement a user interface method, the method comprising the steps of:

- Accepting text input strokes in a first area (Figure 3(b), item 24; column 10, lines 47-48; column 3, lines 20-24)
- Displaying recognized text from the text input strokes in a second area (Figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60; column 3, lines 25-29)
- Displaying the text input strokes in the first area (Figure 3(c), see “very” in item 22; column 9, lines 13-15)
- Recognizing the text input strokes and displaying recognized text in the second area (figure 3(c), see “very” inserted before “fine”; column 10, lines 51-60)
- Displaying a portion of the recognized text in the first area, the portion of the recognized text shown as the text input strokes are recognized (Figure 3(c); column 10, line 61- column 11, line 11)

Takahashi and Berman fail to disclose scrolling the portion of the recognized text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized. However, Liu discloses scrolling the text in the first area as new text input strokes are recognized (column 1, lines 57-65).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi and Berman's method of inputting handwriting with the Liu's method of automatically scrolling handwritten input, since it

would have allowed a user to continue to write without having to manually scroll text or worry about writing newer text on top of older text.

As per dependent claim 22 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi and Liu also disclose implementing editing by replacing one or more previously recognized characters of the portion of the recognized text with newly recognized one or more characters by recognizing new text input strokes made over the one or more previously recognized characters (Takahashi: column 9, lines 32-35; column 10, lines 37-39; column 10, lines 51-60) in a first area (Liu: Figures 3-11).

As per dependent claim 23 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Berman discloses the method of implementing draggable navigation of text by dragging a boundary of an area to change the portion of the recognized text shown in the area (column 9, lines 52-54).

As per dependent claim 24 Takashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 21 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Berman discloses the method wherein the hand-held portable computer device is a personal information device (column 1, lines 41-48; column 11, lines 2-5).

13. Claim 14 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman, and Liu as applied to claim 12 above and in further view of Cobbley et al.

As per dependent claim 14 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi also discloses displaying the text input strokes in a first part of the first touch-screen area (column 3, lines 20-24). However, Takahashi fails to disclose displaying the portion of the recognized text in the second part of the first touch-screen area, wherein the text input strokes are shown in the first part until the text input strokes are recognized and resulting recognized text shown in the second part. However, Cobbley discloses a touch-screen area wherein the input strokes are displayed in a first touch-screen area and displaying the portion of the recognized text in the second part of the first touch-screen area, wherein the text input strokes are shown in the first part until the text input strokes are recognized and resulting recognized text shown in the second part (Figure 1; column 3, lines 26-32).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi's method of inputting strokes with Cobbley's method of displaying recognized text in a second part of a touch screen area, since it would have allowed for user entered text and recognized text to be displayed on a single screen.

14. Claim 19 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman, and Liu in further view of Marianetti, II et al. (U.S. 5,889,888).

As per dependent claim 19 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi, Berman, and Liu fail to disclose a method wherein a first touch-screen display is used to

implement the first area and a second touch-screen display is used to implement the second area. However, Marianetti discloses a method wherein a first touch-screen display is used to implement the first area and a second touch-screen is used to implement a second area (Figure 3).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi, Berman, and Liu's method with Marianetti's implementation of separate display screens, since it would have allowed a user to have separate screens for writing text and another for viewing text.

15. Claim 17 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Takahashi, Berman, and Liu in further view of Bennett.

As per dependent claim 17 Takahashi, Berman, and Liu disclose the limitations similar to those in claim 12 and the same rejection is incorporated herein. Takahashi, Berman, and Liu fail to disclose the method further including the step of implementing tab spots in the touch-screen area to change location of a text entry point with respect to a plurality of fields. However, Bennett discloses the method of implementing tab spots to change location of a text entry point with respect to a plurality of fields (page 10, paragraph 179).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time of the applicant's invention to have combined Takahashi, Berman, and Liu's method of handwriting text input with Bennett's method of changing data fields, since it would have allowed a user to navigate anywhere and edit any field using only one key (Bennett: page 10, paragraph 179).

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Tou et al. (U.S. 5,528,743): Discloses a method and apparatus for editing text (specifically insertion) on a PDA
- Capps et al. (U.S. 5,583,542): Discloses a method and apparatus for editing text (specifically deletion) on a PDA
- Okamoto et al. (U.S. 6,088,481): Discloses handwritten character input to an application program
- Sites (U.S. 6,408,092): Discloses handwritten input into a restricted area
- Kuzunuki et al. (U.S. 5,903,667): Discloses handwriting processing
- Carini et al. (U.S. 6,456,740): Discloses system and method for handwriting recognition
- Boyer (U.S. 6,282,315): Discloses a system for entering handwritten text into computer generated forms

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (703) 605-1203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Conclusion

16. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

- Tou et al. (U.S. 5,528,743): Discloses a method and apparatus for editing text (specifically insertion) on a PDA
- Capps et al. (U.S. 5,583,542): Discloses a method and apparatus for editing text (specifically deletion) on a PDA
- Okamoto et al. (U.S. 6,088,481): Discloses handwritten character input to an application program
- Sites (U.S. 6,408,092): Discloses handwritten input into a restricted area
- Kuzunuki et al. (U.S. 5,903,667): Discloses handwriting processing
- Carini et al. (U.S. 6,456,740): Discloses system and method for handwriting recognition
- Boyer (U.S. 6,282,315): Discloses a system for entering handwritten text into computer generated forms

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Kyle R Stork whose telephone number is (703) 605-1203. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday-Friday (7:30-4:00).

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Stephen Hong can be reached on (703) 308-5465. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Art Unit: 2178

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Kyle Stork
Examiner
Art Unit 2178



STEPHEN S. HONG
PRIMARY EXAMINER